

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,115	SCOTT, MARK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Frantz F. Jules	3617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frantz F. Jules. (3)_____.

(2) Peter Klobuchar. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03/13/2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Monaco et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's argument that the claims 24 disclosing similar subject matter to claim 9 and therefore should be allowed is not persuasive as claim 9 discloses metering pin having tapered cylindrical configuration while claim 24 simply calls for a metering pin extending from the piston head. Applicant's request for reconsideration of claim 25 for not having been addressed in the previous final office action is not persuasive since paragraph 4 of the final office action addressed claim 25. Applicant's contention that none of the references of record suggests the limitation of a remote controller is weak to overcome the rejection of claim 25 and claims 5 and 6 in light of the teaching of the Cope reference which establishes a prima facie case of obviousness .